



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Montespan was not enough to authorize a jury to convict a habitual criminal of petty larceny.

Louis XIV. was not a man of brilliant mind, but he was a man of good sense. It is not possible that he believed such a farrago of nonsense, or was persuaded that Madame de Montespan had been worshipping Ashtaroth and Asmodeus, indulging in all sorts of nastiness, and plotting all kinds of wickedness. It is not necessary to believe such scandals, or to think that the king believed them, to explain her downfall. We need not place faith in black masses or diabolical conjurations, in order to account for the fact that Louis XIV. discarded Madame de Montespan and clove to Madame de Maintenon. The explanation can be based upon one of the most familiar facts in human experience, that a man grows tired of one woman and becomes enamored of another. Nothing is more common; it required no secret crimes on the part of the abandoned favorite to explain the desertion; it rested not on woman's wickedness, but on man's fickleness. But probably most persons who like to read of royal mistresses and royal scandals want their literary viands highly spiced. The offenses of which Mr. Williams accuses Madame de Montespan are bad enough and mysterious enough to suit the strongest taste for hidden and horrid crime. After all, if the readers of his book think Madame de Montespan somewhat worse than she was, no great harm is done. She was, at any rate, bad enough. JAMES BRECK PERKINS.

The Valet's Tragedy and other Studies. By ANDREW LANG. (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1903. Pp. xiv, 366.)

Of these twelve studies three are purely literary, two dealing with the ballads of Lord Bateman and of the Queen's Marie, and the third being an essay on the Bacon-Shakespeare imbroglia. This last is a delightful bit of acute, lucid, and witty criticism; and if the Baconians were but blessed with a shred of humor, Mr. Lang would certainly bring them to reason. Of the remaining essays those which deal with the ghosts of Fisher and Lord Lyttelton possess no historical interest. The "Mystery of James de la Cloche" is of a different character, since James was a supposititious son of Charles II., and since the evidence in support of his paternity establishes the further and much more important fact that Charles was anxious to declare himself a Roman Catholic as early as September, 1665.

The Man in the Iron Mask could not, of course, be omitted from such a collection as this. The Mask was only a valet, according to Mr. Lang. M. Funck-Brentano thought he was an Italian diplomat, and there can be little doubt that he was either one or the other. The general consensus of opinion has been in favor of Funck-Brentano's contention, that the Mask was Mattioli, a Mantuan diplomat. Mr. Lang's arguments are, however, convincing as against Mattioli. The long imprisonment of the valet, Mr. Lang is inclined to think, was the result of "the red tape" of the old régime, a conclusion which recalls Paine's retort to

Burke in the *Rights of Man*: "Mr. Burke might have been in the Bastille his whole life, as well under Louis XVI as Louis XV, and neither the one nor the other have known that such a man as Mr. Burke existed." This was undoubtedly true of the reigns of Louis XV. and Louis XVI., but hardly of that of Louis XIV. Moreover, the quotations from the correspondence of the king and his ministers show clearly enough that they were well aware of the presence of the prisoner and also of his importance. Red tape is an inadequate explanation.

The story of the valet's master reveals Louis XIV.'s brutal disregard of the legal rights of nations and of private individuals. The cruel murder of Roux de Marsilly was less justifiable than that of the Duc d'Enghien and infinitely more horrible and inhumane. The act is a parallel to the illegal butchery of Patkul by Charles XII.

The voices of Jeanne d'Arc and the story of the false Jeanne furnish Mr. Lang with two more mysteries. It hardly seems reasonable to be surprised because people in 1450 believed that Jeanne had not been executed or because her brothers and the city government of Orleans recognized the Pretender as the Maid. We should have to know all the motives which these people had for recognition before deciding on the question, and these never can be known. As to the lack of belief in Jeanne's death, that is what was to be expected. To convince oneself of this, one has only to recall the avidity with which semi-intelligent people in our own day believe that the Dauphin escaped from the Temple and lived laborious days in the wild west of America; or that Marshal Ney never was shot, but quietly retired on half-pay.

In the essay on Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey, Mr. Lang attacks the theory recently advanced by Pollock to the effect that Godfrey was murdered "by 'the Queen's confessor', Le Fevre, 'a Jesuit', and some other Jesuits, with lay assistance". Mr. Pollock reached this result by a process of exclusion, but it is evident that the process of exclusion will not avail here, because no one knows all the elements in the case, and after excluding all the known possibilities, a score of unknown ones may remain. In any case, Mr. Lang shows beyond a doubt that Pollock has reached his conclusion on insufficient evidence. There is no reason for supposing that Le Fevre was the queen's confessor, or that there was a Jesuit by that name; it is absurd to swallow the lies of France and Bedloe, and impossible to pick out the truth in these lies; the theory of murder by the Jesuits cannot be established by such evidence. But having confuted Mr. Pollock, Mr. Lang has no explanation of his own. He leans toward the hypothesis of suicide, though he thinks the evidence of the surgeons conclusive against this. This certainly does not follow. Surgeons occasionally err, and most grossly. If the surgeons' evidence were all that stood in the way, one should have no difficulty in accepting the hypothesis of suicide, but there are countless other objections. So there are to any other hypothesis.

In the essay on Amy Robsart all that we yet know concerning the affair is contained. Elizabeth, so far as the evidence now accessible

goes, is cleared of foreknowledge of Amy's death ; the improbability that any murder was committed is shown ; and it is evident that if there were a murder, the Earl of Leicester was not privy to it. There remain two inexplicable facts : Elizabeth herself spoke of "an attempt" in regard to Amy ; and no one knows how the unfortunate woman came to her death. So much is clear. For the rest Mr. Lang's reasoning is at times too tenuous, and particularly so in regard to a remark made by Cecil to the Spanish ambassador to the effect that "they were thinking of destroying Lord Robert's wife" and that she "was taking care not to be poisoned". Mr. Lang presumes that Cecil said this because he was told something of the sort by a Doctor Bayly. That Bayly knew anything is not certain. He was asked to prescribe for Amy Robsart, says an anonymous libel published twenty years later, and immediately inferred that his patient was to be poisoned. This is all, even if we credit the libel. Mr. Lang credits it, because Bayly didn't deny it. But there might be a score of reasons for not denying an assertion made concerning an event which had occurred twenty years earlier, and an assertion which imputed no guilt to Bayly. In any case, Bayly's not denying the libel does not, as Mr. Lang infers, establish its truth. But having proceeded thus far on the basis of an anonymous libel and of Froude's version of a Spanish despatch, Mr. Lang next guesses that Bayly "blabbed" to Cecil, for if not, how did Cecil happen to speak to the Spanish ambassador at this time about Amy's taking care not to be poisoned. Since such an idea was common property throughout the country-side, one might guess that Cecil picked it up without Bayly's assistance. Again, Lang's interpretation of the phrase "as all men said" (he quotes it later and incorrectly "as all men suppose") is probably mistaken. What "all men said" was that Amy was found murdered, not that the coroner's inquest had so declared. Nor is Lang justified in arguing, because Appleyard declared that the jury "had not yet given up their verdict", that such was the fact. The evidence leads one to believe that Appleyard was called to account for saying this when he knew the fact to be otherwise.

As always Mr. Lang writes easily and pleasantly, though in a loose and rather slovenly style ; he is not always accurate, and occasionally, as noted above, gives two versions for the same short sentence ; he is tiresomely repetitious, and cannot get through an essay without solemnly asserting of some one that "his doom was dight" ; and he uses scraps of French when English would convey the meaning quite as forcibly.

RALPH C. H. CATTERALL.

The Jesuits in Great Britain : an Historical Inquiry into their Political Influence. By WALTER WALSH, F. R. Hist. S. (London : George Routledge and Sons, Ltd. ; New York : E. P. Dutton and Company. 1903. Pp. xiii, 358.)

As one might expect from Mr. Walsh's interests and activities and from the character of his previous writings, the present work is decidedly